



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/791,791	03/04/2004	Yoshihiro Nakao	47635-0002	5495
55694	7590	06/13/2008		
DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH (DC)			EXAMINER	MARTINELLI, JAMES
1500 K STREET, N.W. SUITE 1100 WASHINGTON, DC 20005-1209			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER 1634
				MAIL DATE 06/13/2008
				DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/791,791	Applicant(s) NAKAO ET AL.
	Examiner James Martinell	Art Unit 1634

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2/1/08 & 4/25/08.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,8,10-32 and 34-46 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) 10-32 and 34-46 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1 and 8 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 20 July 2006 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____

Art Unit: 1634

Claims 10-32 and 34-46 stand withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on December 29, 2005.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. This rejection is repeated for reasons already of record (*e.g.*, Office action mailed August 20, 2007, paragraph bridging pages 3-4). Applicants' arguments (response filed February 1, 2008, pages 8-10) are not convincing because the *S. cerevisiae* strain C288C genome is presented in the application. Since the *S. cerevisiae* strain C288C genome is needed to understand the claims, reference for said genome to a website is an improper incorporation by reference because a website is not an allowed U.S. Patent Application, U.S. patent application publication, or a U.S. Patent. In addition, the content of any given website may change at any time. Accordingly, the claims lack an adequate written description. See MPEP 608.01(p)I.

Claims 1 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The claims require *S. cerevisiae* strain S288C, which strain is not established in this record to be permanently available to the public (see MPEP 2401-2421 and 37 CFR §§ 1.801-1.809).

Claims 1 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claims are vague, indefinite, and incomplete.

- (a) The claims are incomplete because claim 1 refers to amino acid sequences encoded by *S. cerevisiae* strain S288C genes. Since the *S. cerevisiae* strain C288C genome is needed to understand the claims, reference for said genome to a website is an improper incorporation by reference because a website is not an allowed U.S. Patent Application, U.S. patent application publication, or a U.S. Patent. In addition, the content of any given website may change at any time. Accordingly, the claims are incomplete. See MPEP 608.01(p)I.
- (b) The recitation of "an amino acid sequence" (claim 1) is vague and indefinite because it is not clear whether the claim intends to compare sequences of entire polypeptides or merely subsequences of polypeptides (*e.g.*, a subsequence as short as two contiguous amino acids might meet the limitation).
- (c) Claims 1 and 8 are rejected one over the other as duplicate claims. The "brewing yeast" of claim 8 is generic to the "beer" yeast of claim 1. Thus, the two claims have the same scope.
- (d) The recitation of "the industrial yeast" (claim 8) is incomplete because there is no antecedent basis for the term.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary.

Art Unit: 1634

Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Olesen et al (FEMS Yeast Research 2: 563 (2000) in view of Nakagawa et al (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2006/0228712). Olesen et al teaches the determination of the function of beer yeast genes by comparing the transcriptomes of beer yeast and *S. cerevisiae* (e.g. see the Abstract, the paragraph bridging pages 563-564, the first full paragraph on page 564, and Section 3.6). Nakagawa et al teaches the identification of gene functions by comparing biological sequence data between bacteria and yeast, including *S. cerevisiae* strain S288C (e.g., see Nakagawa et al, paragraphs 0004, 0011, 0014, 0020, 0245, 0253-0256, 0282-0289, 0542, and 0543 and Table 1 at page 82 (SEQ ID NO: 1745 line) and page 127 (SEQ ID NO: 3203 line)). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to compare sequences of *S. cerevisiae* strain S288C to the beer yeast sequences of Olesen et al in the manner taught by Nakagawa et al in order to determine gene and protein functions in the beer yeast.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James Martinell whose telephone number is (571) 272-0719.

The examiner works a flexible schedule and can be reached by phone and voice mail. Alternatively, a request for a return telephone call may be e-mailed to james.martinell@uspto.gov. Since e-mail communications may not be secure, it is suggested that information in such requests be limited to name, phone number, and the best time to return the call.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ram Shukla, can be reached on (571) 272-0735.

OFFICIAL FAX NUMBER

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300. Any Official Communication to the USPTO should be faxed to this number.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to (571) 272-0547.

Patent applicants with problems or questions regarding electronic images that can be viewed in the Patent Application Information Retrieval system (PAIR) can now contact the USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center (Patent EBC) for assistance. Representatives are available to answer your questions daily from 6 am to midnight (EST). The toll free number is (866) 217-9197. When calling please have your application serial or patent number, the type of document you are having an image problem with, the number of pages and the specific nature of the problem. The Patent Electronic Business Center will notify applicants of the resolution of the problem within 5-7 business days. Applicants can also check PAIR to confirm that the problem has been corrected. The USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center is a complete service center supporting all patent business on the Internet. The USPTO's PAIR system provides Internet-based access to patent application status and history information. It also enables applicants to view the scanned images of their own application file folder(s) as well as general patent information available to the public.

For all other customer support, please call the USPTO Call Center (UCC) at 800-786-9199.

/James Martinell/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1634